

DD/A Regist

77-4405

Executive Registry

4 AUG 1977

77-771814

MEMORANDUM FOR: Acting Deputy Director of
Central Intelligence

FROM: Michael J. Malanick
Acting Deputy Director for
Administration

SUBJECT: Studies in Intelligence

1. Action Requested: This memorandum requests your approval to realign the administrative arrangements concerning the Editor of the publication Studies in Intelligence.

2. Background: The staffing, supervisory arrangement, and administrative support for Studies in Intelligence have undergone considerable evolution since the periodical was started in 1955. The present Editor, [REDACTED] while carried on the OTR table of organization, reports under a loose arrangement to the Editorial Board.

25X1

3. A recent survey has revealed, among other findings, a general consensus that Studies in Intelligence could be a better publication with more systematic planning and management. One step for improvement would, we believe, be to resubordinate and relocate the Editor in the Center for the Study of Intelligence. Since the Center was started two years ago, a substantial number of the articles in Studies have been the research papers produced by fellows assigned to the Center. This is a natural relationship, as Studies provides an effective and convenient mechanism for disseminating the results of the Center's research program. The proposed shift would have the further advantage of enabling the Editor of Studies to undertake additional editorial work for the Center, thereby providing fuller utilization of his services.

4. Recommendation: It is recommended that the Editor of Studies in Intelligence be relocated to the Chamber of Commerce building and placed under the administrative direction of the Director of the Center for the Study of

EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE

NOTE: PER OTR: - this is overtaken by events - see later memo's on
Studies of Intelligence - ER 77- 10418 and ER 77-5175 -

SUBJECT: Studies in Intelligence

Intelligence and that the Editorial Board continue to provide substantive guidance to the publication.

/s/ Michael J. Malanick
Michael J. Malanick

APPROVED:

Acting Deputy Director of
Central Intelligence

DISAPPROVED:

Acting Deputy Director of
Central Intelligence

DATE: _____

Distribution:

Orig - Return to ADDA
1 - ADDCI
✓ 1 - ER
2 - ADDA

Memorandum Registry
77-5905

26 September 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Members of the Board of Editors,
Studies in Intelligence

I am forwarding a memorandum summarizing the major points, as I recall them, that were raised during my individual meetings with each of you. It is my hope that we can have a good attendance at the October 7-8 Brushwood meeting, because I would like to have an interactive discussion on the future of Studies.

Our discussion need not be limited to matters mentioned in the attachment. Most of these were covered to some extent in the Jones' report of last January. There are other subjects in the Jones' report that also deserve Board deliberation. It is not my intention to force decisions on all these matters at the Board meeting, but I would hope that we could find consensus on some, and on others point the way towards developing a consensus.

The Jones' report represented a serious and considerable effort to pose a number of fundamental issues, and I do not feel we have really come to grip with them. The issue of the relationship of Studies to the Center seized our attention, and other problems have not been faced squarely. While the Studies/Center relationship is not resolved to everyone's satisfaction, as revealed in the attachment, it also requires further deliberation, for the future of the Center itself is now under study.

If you are not going to be able to attend the next Board meeting, I would appreciate hearing from you.



25X1

Attachment:
As stated

MEMORANDUM REGISTRY FILE 5-23

25X1

26 September 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Members of the Board of Editors,
Studies of Intelligence

During the past several weeks, I have had an opportunity to discuss with each member of the Board his thoughts on the future of our publication. No attempt was made to structure these conversations along any particular lines, but a number of suggestions emerged related to similar themes. On some there appears to be a degree of consensus; on others there are divergencies of view.

Consensus:

1. Most of you feel that the publication is, on balance too retrospective, i.e., a little too much emphasis on the past and too many "ego trip" stories of adventure. The view is frequently expressed that we need to look ahead, relate to today's problems, tackle key issues in the community today and, so far as they can be perceived, tomorrow. Some of you stressed that there is no opposition to history per se but for the most part historical pieces should put perspective on day's problems.
2. There was unanimity that there needs to be an expanded and more aggressive editorial role. In some cases, an editor needs to work more closely with contributors before a piece is formally presented to the Board. Writers deserve more feedback when their articles are turned down, and this is particularly so when the article has potential to be salvaged. One view was expressed that we need to lean harder on the writers. It was also suggested that we find better ways to provide guidance on the kinds of pieces desired in an attempt to stir up interest. Another suggestion was that we develop themes for a few publications in advance, focusing on key issues of today and then seek authors to develop the subject matter (a possible dissent

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

here emerges from one comment to the effect that we should avoid making the publication too structured because there is value in its casual, informal approach).

Another suggestion is that we could do more by way of sanitizing pieces of past issues that have current interest to the literature of intelligence. We might also seek to produce anthologies of pieces from past publications built around an issue which remains of current interest.

Differences:

1. There is disagreement on how far we should go in an effort to make studies a more community oriented publication. There is general agreement on continuing to distribute it within the community and to solicit articles from outside CIA. There are strong differences, however, on whether we should expand the Board to include members from outside CIA in order to accomplish this.

2. Differences on the relationship of Studies to the Center for the Study of Intelligence continue to exist. All seem to agree on the utility of developing a closer substantive relationship. Some remain concerned that an integrated administrative relationship would destroy or reduce the Board's control and flexibility and that a merger of the two would put Studies in a straight jacket. Those who hold this view do not want to see Studies have too much dependence on the Center.

Others favor a more organic relationship in view of the related and overlapping roles of Studies and the Center, while preserving the Board's responsibilities for policy direction and substantive content. For them it is not a question of Studies dependence on the Center, but a matter of devising an acceptable arrangement to assure continuing positive interaction for the benefit of both.

CONFIDENTIAL

Board Membership:

1. Should it be for a fixed term? If not, how do we assure a proper turnover?

As noted above, should the Board include members from other agencies of the Intelligence Community?

How do we obtain the view points of younger elements in the Agency? If we do not accomplish this through members of the Board, should we organize an advisory group, make more use of the MAGs, or something else?

Should we find a way to use annuitants as consultants?

Finally, there was general agreement that the size of the Board is about right although some would expand it enough to obtain community participation.

Other Issues:

1. A few of you expressed concern that we are not doing enough to provide incentive for writers, and specifically expressed more aggressive exploration of the possibility of providing financial stipends, including stipends for retirees who write for the publication. It was also suggested that we assure recognition for contributors from DCI or DDCI.

2. With the literature of intelligence expanding, it was thought that we ought to seek more book reviews by younger authors.

3. Some feel that we could usefully expand Studies in order to reach more readers. The Jones' study reported that doubling the print of each issue would only cost an additional \$500 as compared to the approximate cost of \$2,500 for the current print run.



25X1

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/12/22 : CIA-RDP80M00165A001500100001-7

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2004/12/22 : CIA-RDP80M00165A001500100001-7